Letters to the Editor.

The Editor does not hold himself responsible for opinions expressed by his correspondents. Neither can he undertake to return, or to correspond with the writers of, rejected manuscripts intended for this or any other part of NATURE. *No notice is taken of anonymous communications.*]

Relativity and the Æther.

WHILE at Brighton recently I visited its excellent Public Library, and there found the three supplementary volumes of the "Ency. Brit." containing the remarkably lucid article on relativity by Dr. Jeans. Many have written and multitudes have read about this subject, but I venture to say that nowhere can be found a more compact and accurate presentation of the strict relativist position. There is nothing anæmic or half-hearted about it; and I imagine that while non-physicists will find the article readable, most physicists will find its crisp clearness instructive. Very little can a pragmatic or anti-philosophic relativist like myself find to disagree with in it, and where I do disagree it is just possible that both or neither may be right.

Still I do want to quote and criticise one clear and definite sentence; into which I insert only references to my comments which follow, so as not to spoil it.

On the electromagnetic theory of Faraday and Maxwell, waves of light "were simply waves in the æther and travelled with an absolute velocity c determined once and for all by the structure of the æther. (1) On this view it was quite certain (2) that an observer moving through the æther with a velocity u would measure the velocity of light travelling in the same direction as himself as $c-u$. Relativity teaches (3) that this velocity is always precisely c, and this in itself disposes (4) of the æther of Faraday and Maxwell."

On this pronouncement I comment thus :—

(1) That is certainly true.

(2) Not *quite* certain. It might have been thought certain; but the FitzGerald contraction is an indication of unexpected possibilities in the instruments of measure. Still, no first order loophole has been suggested, and the challenge is a legitimate one. Would that the experiment could be tried! I assume that every one will agree that it has not yet been tried, and that it is difficult to devise a sure and certain way.

(3) It certainly and very forcibly does so teach.

(4) But a hypothesis, even the foundation hypothesis of a developed theory, cannot logically be cited as if it were an experimentally ascertained and conclusive fact; nor can it be used to give a knock-out blow to another theory. Opposing theories still have to fight it out. Full-blown Relativity might equally well be said to dispose of Matter, by reducing it to the unevenness of a field, or to the tensor $-8\pi T_{\mu\nu}$, or to an algebraic expression like $G_{\mu\nu}-\frac{1}{2}g_{\mu\nu}G$, which apparently is conserved like matter, is obedient to our laws of motion, and vanishes in what we call empty space.

I do not think that even Dr. Jeans will claim that there is any ascertained fact to substantiate what I have marked as (3). It all depends upon ux/c^2 and differing estimates of time.

It may be said that conclusions of relativity have been verified, and that thus the theory is established. I should prefer to say that some mathematical deductions arrived at by the relativity method have been brilliantly verified, and hence that the method has pragmatically been proved to be sound. I should not say that its philosophic foundations were established; still less that they have rendered all other foundations rotten.

It would seem rather that more than one mode of expression is possible for even the simplest fact, and that a criterion of absolute and exclusive truth in any statement is increasingly difficult to find. A theory which renders it uncertain whether the Fire of London preceded or succeeded the outburst of Nova Persei, whether the sun revolves round the earth or *vice versa*, and whether a much-travelled man's death preceded his birth, should not be too positive when it leaves its own realm and enters the region of fact and reality, whatever those possibly question-begging terms may mean. Perhaps there is no absolute truth. More probably absolute truth exists, but is not easy to arrive at.

Meanwhile we may be grateful that, thanks to the new school, we are beginning to recognise the uncertainty and contingency inseparable from all forms of human statement. Let our geniuses not extinguish but supplement each other. There is room not only for Einstein and Weyl but also for Newton and Maxwell. The reconciliation may not be obvious, the connecting passage is difficult to find, but it would be wise to keep the door ajar.

OLIVER LODGE.

The Legal Equivalent of the Metre.

MAY I correct in NATURE an unfortunate error which occurs on p. 580 of the "Dictionary of Applied Physics"? It is there stated that the equivalent of the metre in inches is 39·37008, and the Order in Council of May 19, 1898, is referred to as giving the legalised value of this quantity. The information was taken, by permission, from the "Computer's Handbook," issued by the Meteorological Office in 1921, and the inference is that the above figure is the legalised value.

Dr. Stratton, of the United States Bureau of Standards, recently directed my attention to the error. The legalised value given in the Order of Council is 39·370113 inches.

The "Computer's Handbook" states that: "The most recent values for the metrical equivalent of the fundamental British Units are those contained in the Order of Council of 19th May 1898," and, after a reference to earlier editions of the "Handbook," continues: "Values in accordance with the Order in Council of 1898 have now been substituted."

I assumed this to mean that the actual legalised values had been used and printed the figures without further verification, but this is not the case.

The figure given—39·37008—is deduced from the relation 1 inch = 25·4 millimetres; the legalised value of the inch in millimetres is 25·399978. The difference, less than one part in a million, is negligible for nearly all purposes and there would be many advantages in accepting, as the legalised ratio, 1 inch = 25·4 millimetres, but this has not been done.

At present some confusion may easily arise; for in America the ratio 1 metre = 39·370000 inches has been adopted.

We thus have the equivalents given in the following table:

	Metre in Inches.	Inches in Millimetres.
America	39·370000	25·400051
"Computer's Handbook"	39·37008	25·40000
British Legalised Value	39·370113	25·399978

© 1922 Nature Publishing Group

The matter is discussed in an article on metrology, by Mr. Sears, which will appear in the forthcoming volume of the "Dictionary of Applied Physics."

R. T. GLAZEBROOK.

Coton End, 63 Grange Road, Cambridge, September 9.

On the Reality of Nerve-Energy.

IF I have understood Prof. Fraser Harris's letter in NATURE of September 9, p. 342, it is a plea for the more widespread use of the term "nerve-energy" by physiologists and for the investigation of it as a special manifestation of energy like heat, light, or electricity. It is no doubt quite true that the term has a definite and useful meaning in psychology and psycho-pathology, though "mental energy" would probably do as well in most cases.

As a physiological concept, however, "nerve-energy" has little to recommend it. Some idea of the difficulties which are likely to attend its use may be seen even in Prof. Harris's letter; moreover, there is very little need to postulate a special kind of energy to explain the nervous impulse and its conduction, for of all the different activities of living cells that of conduction can be most readily described in terms of physics and chemistry.

The momentary change which makes the nervous impulse seems to consist in a depolarisation of the surface layers of the nerve fibre, a resulting increase in permeability, and an escape of ions from the interior of the fibre. The movement of ions brings about an increase of permeability in further sections of the fibre and a decrease in the sections previously active, so that the disturbance spreads but does not last for more than a brief time at any one point. The process is so simple in its essentials that Prof. Lillie has been able to construct model nerve fibres of iron wires coated with a film of passive iron and immersed in nitric acid. These models copy the behaviour of a nerve fibre with surprising fidelity.

For some time past, evidence has accumulated in favour of this explanation; it would be quite misleading to suggest that every detail of the conduction of the impulse is understood, but the broad outlines of the "membrane theory" have not been seriously challenged. The energetics of the process were worked out by Bernstein. The system loses free energy when the ions escape from regions of high to regions of low concentration, and ultimately this must be replaced by the metabolism of foodstuffs in the fibre. The splitting up of a large molecule into a number of smaller ones would suffice to restore the concentration differences upon which the movement of ions depends, and at various stages heat may be given out or absorbed from the surroundings. In no part of this scheme is there any need, or any opportunity, for the introduction of a special form of energy peculiar to nerves.

If the term "nerve-energy" is to be retained it might be used to mean the total potential energy in the neurone available for use in the transmission of impulses, but it is doubtful whether much would be gained by the measurement of this quantity. Prof. A. V. Hill has shown that the energy expended in the passage of a single impulse is extremely small, and the neurone is able to replenish its stores continually from the nutrient fluids which surround it. When failure of conduction occurs it seems to be due more often to a failure of the surface reaction than to an exhaustion of the store of potential energy in the fibre.

E. D. ADRIAN.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

Interspecific Sterility.

IN his letter on this subject (September 2, p. 312), Mr. Harrison states some interesting facts regarding the chromosome numbers in Salix. This appears to be the first case in plants where tetraploidy is accompanied by very little external change. Both tetraploid and hexaploid numbers in a genus have long been known, for example in Musa, but the point of my remark regarding interspecific sterility in crosses between diploid and tetraploid forms appears to have been missed. It is not that there is any difficulty in making such crosses in the first place. Usually they are easily made, but the result is a triploid form with an unstable chromosome content.

If such crosses between a diploid and a tetraploid species occur in Nature, they cannot lead to a permanent, stable form, except by apogamous reproduction. The hybrid may cross back with either parent, but this leads again to new and irregular chromosome numbers, with the result that, in the absence of apogamy, stability will be reached only when the extra chromosomes have been lost and the number has reverted to the diploid, or possibly in some cases to a balanced intermediate number. The two parental species, respectively diploid and tetraploid, will in the meantime each have carried on its own line of descent.

It follows that if a tetraploid form arises from a diploid species in Nature, it will continue to breed true, while its hybrids with the parent species will not give rise to a permanent line of descent unless there is apogamous reproduction. This is, for practical purposes, a condition of physiological isolation. *Spiranthes cernua* is a probable example of this sort, and there are many others. Once two such independent lines of descent are established, the divergence between them may go on increasing as fresh variations occur in each series.

R. RUGGLES GATES.

King's College, London.

Micro-Chemical Methods in the Practical Teaching of Chemistry.

IN view of the strenuous efforts now being made by education authorities in this country to economise on educational expenditure, considerable interest attaches to Prof. Egerton Grey's letter on the application of micro-chemical methods in the teaching of chemistry (NATURE, September 2, p. 309). During the War we conducted a course of practical instruction in chemistry in the Internment Camp for Civilian Prisoners of War in Ruhleben, and the difficulty of procuring large quantities of reagents led to the adoption of "Micro" methods wherever possible. Although we had at times forty students preparing for university examinations, the consumption of chemical reagents was extremely small in comparison with what would be required in the ordinary way. To give just one example, half a litre of nitric acid—a precious liquid in the camp—was found sufficient to supply the needs of these students for several months. One enterprising student fitted for himself a fully equipped "micro" laboratory in a tiny corner of his loft and undertook interesting research work.

A further advantage of the method is that the quantities involved are so small that the students can study the chemical properties of many of the rarer elements with great advantage to themselves and small expense to the laboratory. We are in hearty agreement with Prof. Grey as to the economic and educational advantages of the micro-chemical methods.

J. W. BLAGDEN.
A. WECHSLER.

© 1922 Nature Publishing Group